

### REMARKS

#### Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 4 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Berstis et al.* (US Patent No. 6,540,458 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims is requested.

Exemplary Claim 6 has been amended to recite a method of establishing access control, including the step of:

*setting access controls for at least two of the communications programs within the data processing system that employ different communications protocols as a function of the content label categories and associated user restrictions.*

On page 4 of the present Office Action, it is argued that this step of the present invention is shown by *Berstis* at column 12, lines 13-65 and column 4, lines 7-32. However, at column 12, *Berstis* merely teaches the general structure of the PICS specification, and does not describe setting access controls as a function of categories or user restrictions. At column 4, *Berstis* describes the configuration of network 100. While the distribution of programs and other applications from one computer to another is described (column 4, lines 10-15), there is no discussion of content label categories or associated user restrictions, either with respect to each of the clients 108, 110, and 112 or to "each of a plurality of communication programs" within an individual data processing system, as is required by Claim 6.

Still more particularly, nowhere within Columns 12 or 4 is there a description of setting access controls as a function of content label categories and associated user restriction "for at least two of the communications programs within the data processing system that employ different communications protocols" as recited in Claim 6 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that *Berstis* does not show or suggest 1) "setting access controls for at least two of the communications programs within the data processing system that employ different communications protocols" and 2) setting such access controls "as a function of the content label categories and associated user restrictions", and therefore that the rejection of Claim 6 under Section 102 should be reconsidered.

With respect to exemplary Claim 7, therein is recited the step of:

*during installation of a communications program subsequent to setting access controls for each communications program within the data processing system as a function of the content label categories and associated user restrictions, checking for existing access control settings for other communications programs and setting access controls for the communications program being installed utilizing the existing access control settings.*

On page 4 of the present Office Action, it is submitted that this step of Claim 7 is taught by *Berstis* at column 12, lines 13-65. Again, at column 12, *Berstis* only teaches the general structure of the PICS specification. Nothing within column 12 teaches:


1. *"installation of a communications program,"*
2. *"setting access controls for each communication program within the data processing system as a function of the content label categories and associated user restrictions,"*
3. *"checking for existing access control settings for other communication programs,"* or
4. *"setting access controls for the communications program being installed utilizing the existing access control settings."*

As recited in Claim 7, access controls for a communication program are set based on similar access control settings already set in other communication programs installed within a computer system. *Berstis* nowhere teaches that a computer system is checked for access controls in other communication applications. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that *Berstis* does not show or suggest Claim 7 in the present application.

For the reasons given above, Applicants submit that Claims 6 and 7 are not shown or suggested by *Berstis* and that the rejection of those claims under Section 102 should be withdrawn. For the same reasons as given above with respect to the patentability of Claim 6 and 7, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13, 14, 20, and 21 are also not shown or suggested by *Berstis*, and that the rejection of those claims under Section 102 should also be withdrawn.

It is believed that no fee is required by this amendment; however, in the event any additional fees are required, please charge any such fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account Number 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig Yudell

Reg. No. 19,083

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 969

Austin, Texas 78767-0969

Tel.: 512.472.7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Doc ID 114766